P. F. 89 of 98

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1897-98

191 . .

(L. R.)

File No. 99 of 97

Serial Nos. 1 to 10

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 10

In ~~Part~~ **B** for November 1902

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Nanjundiah, Shanbhog Gumasta of Goliara-hosahalli, Chamarajapatna Taluk praying his dismissal.

Exd 10 Confirmed 1897

✓

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

(Ser. No-10)

Deposition of Shanbhoge Ranjundaiya, 9-1-8-97.

=

Javaregowda, son of Dedderi Bommegowda of this village (Byaladakere) had converted into kitchen garden the land attached to the village site and the tank bund. It is true that on 18-4-97 I have entered a remark at the foot of the records to the effect that, as directed by the ~~Taluk Authorities~~, I recovered from the said Javaregowda the sum of Rs 3-15-- at 1/a per sq. yd., and entered the same in the Khirdi. The said Javaregowda has not paid the amount till now. Javaregowda who had come to Gollara-hosahalli, told me that

the

he would go to the Ki, V
village and send the
amount, and that I might
send a reply to the Shekdar's
Hukum. Relying upon his
promise I entered the
remarks above referred to
at the foot of the said
Hukum, and returned the
records with the peon who
brought the latter. Jawane-
-fouda did not send Rs 3-15-;
nor did I remember to collect
the amount and remit
the same to the Treasury.
Jawanefouda may be sent
for and examined. I did
not credit the amount at
the time in the Khirdi thinking
that might do so and remit
the amount on receipt of
the same. I have taken
back the Khirdi which I
had produced for perusal.
It is my fault not to have
collected the amount through
want of memory and

carelessness. I may be excused this time. If the amount had been included in the Jamabandi (account) I would have remembered of it. But I forgot it. Though the amount is lying with Jawanpowda uncollected from him, yet, if it should be ordered that I myself should pay it, I am ~~always~~ ready to do so.

Ramjirao's deposition

(A file. Ex. No. 10 res with)

Q 14-8-97:

Q. "You have certified below the account that you prepared for Vitthal Timmapowda for S. No. 73 of Kalasinda village. What is the cause of your omitting to mention in that

that certificate (1) the trees and other valuable property existing in the N-

(2) about the fine which had been levied on certain people during the year Nammathu for putting up Kuri Poffa (Sheep-fold) on the land -

+(3) about Order No- 8 issued from the Augir directing that as it is a Kharab land, a recommendation might be sent in for including it in the village site?

A - "I should have mentioned the facts which had (ocurred?) transpired.) It is my mistake to have omitted to do so. Even now the said people have not removed the Poffa from the land."

29/4/98

5

Petition No: 2026, dt 8-2-98.

Petitioner:- Ranjundaiya
Shanbhoga finna
of Solavanahalli
Hassan.

Subject:

Appeal against the order of the Dy Commr of Hassan No 529/668, dt 25-10-97, dismissing petn from the office of Shanbhoga-functions

Fact of the case

Part(3)-

On 10-2-97 one Vaikkan Thimmegowda filed a document for land S. No 73 of Kaikonda village, Channarayapatna taluk, bearing an area of 13-5 and an accessment

[NOTE:- The vernacular records are divided into 4 parts. The 1st consists of the Appeal petn & the Kan. memo. regarding the facts of the case; the 2nd of papers connected with the charges of misappropriation of Rs 3/- brought against petr; & the 3rd of those relating to petr's irregularities with regard to the document for S.No 73 of Kaikonda village; & the 4th of those relating to Shanbhogi. Precis is put up for the 2nd & 3rd parts. Part 3rd is taken up first.]

ment of Rs 6-8-0 and
prayed that the same might
be given him for cultivation
for the year Durmukhi (1896-97).

At the hearing of this
Karkhast the Shanbhoge
Ranjmudaiya certified
that the land applied for
consisted of a kharab
area of 6a-10g; that the S.No x
was of it, as given above,
here waste, and that there
there were no Darkhasts to
show that the land had been
assigned within 3 years.

(The omission of this important fact was pointed out to the Clerk by me)

After some preliminary
enquiries as to the truth of
the above pretension, regarding
the land applied for, the
Amildar directed the Sheristadar
as follows:-

x No 20, 9-13-2-97.

"S.No 73 applied for by
the Darkhastdar has been
entered in the B-list and
is mentioned to contain 1 Dad tree

and

(× pet[1])

land & date plant. But the Shanbhogue has certified that there are no trees whatever on the land. Submit his explanation for ~~incorrect~~ signing falsely. You had better inspect the land yourself and submit the date-tree list.

" Dalkhastdar and others had put up a Kuri Koppa on the land. The fact has been brought out in the talkarar-list, and it has been ordered that the said koppa should be removed within 8 days, and that if the persons shall fail to do so, the assessment and cess should be recovered from them in the shape of fine. The correspondence relating to this matter has been sent to you with No — of 26th January. Along with your report as to how this matter stands submit also a report on the

the darkhast in question ends.

"As for the Huzur order relating to the disintegration of 6-10 out of S. No. 73 and its inclusion in the village-site, you have been directed to effect the changes required and send a report. It is not possible to dispose of the darkhast previous to the receipt of your report. Submit it therefore soon."

The Shekdar in pursuance of the above order took the explanation of the shanbhoge which ran to the effect that the latter had omitted to maintain the number of trees and other things* in his certificate, they stood outside the cultivable portion and as corresponded with prior to about the separation of the waste from the arable portion and attaching it to the village-site. This explanation was accompanied

* Fuller's Earth
Kattes
Kuri Vorpia.

Paper (3).

by the Wain-tree dist. This shows the existence of 1 date-tree and 5 date plants with stems situated in an area of 6-89 of dry land. The Sheristadar in the Remarks column says that the trees are not attached to the Zoddy grove, and recommends the grant of the land to the Sanctuary on the ground that it is situated in the centre of cultivable lands. The Amildar has ordered in the remarks column that the land might be given in public sale. The Sheristadar covering report states that of the 8 persons that had put up Kuri Coppa in S. No. 73, three had removed the coppa within the time allowed them; & that the Shanbhogs had been supplied with

No. 21/29, dt 20-3-97

Sastrulu

Lakshman to collect the fine from the remaining five.

On 22-3-97 the Muldar in reporting* to the Dy Commr all the above particulars about the Lakshat stated that he thought it reasonable to fine the Shan Bhoge for reporting falsely Rs 3/- for this time and to warn him against the repetition of the same action ~~next time~~.

* No 1212, d 22-3-97.

Whereupon the Dy Commr ordered as follows:-

"The fine you have recommended for the Shan-bhoge ~~crime~~ of fraud is not enough - Why not punish him criminally? If leniency is shown in such cases it will give room for great injustice. Submit a detailed report and inform if there is any previous correspondence in the

No 871, d 30-3-97

the matter.

Accordingly the Auditor stated that he had already submitted with his N° 1289, of 29-3-97, the file relating to some previous dispute against the Shambhoge, x requested that orders might be passed towards the disposal of the darkhast.

On 26-4-97 the Dy-Commr stated x that the records sent with the Auditor's said N° 1289 related to the Shambhoki, and were not of a nature to be disposed of without reference to some other correspondence called for ~~about by that~~ ~~Accountant~~; that, with regard to the matter of darkhast, it was impossible to ~~se~~ pass any orders unless it was explained why 6 and odd acres of waste land were set apart.

x N° 1073, of 26-4-97

He

He also directed that the
Mojamidar might be
ordered to show by a red
and blue pencil mark where
and why the Kharab was
marked, and that particulars
as to what the extent of
the cultivable portion is
and what steps should on
~~Khalsa~~ it might be
reported.

The Mojamidar to whom
this order was communi-
cated supplied the following
information regarding S.No 73 :—

Kharab — a- g
" - 31 for roads — Date tree
" - 23 - " - 2 Kallas
4-36 Rocky soil
Total 6-10

Cultivable portion — 6a- 39g. —— Road + 10 date plants.

The figures for date trees
as given by Mojamidar not
tallying with that given by the
Shekdar in his Date-tree List,
the latter was directed by the
Amildar to explain the difference
The Shekdar accordingly
reported

reported that this difference was caused by the Inspector taking into account all the plant standing on the S.P., whereas his list contained only such as were likely to grow into healthy trees; that his figures as given in the said "list" were correct, & that if there was any doubt, the Lodge Inspector might be directed to examine it.

The Lodge Inspector was accordingly directed to report on the following points:-

(1) What is the number of Lodge trees in the S.P.?

(2) How many of the trees are suitable for tapping?

(3) How many of them will be liable to be destroyed by the plough share?

(4) In how many days can

can the grown up plants would be fit for tapping?

(5) Is the land near to the Toddy grove?

On 11-8-97 the Toddy Insp.r reports that the land was found to contain 1 big date tree and 10 small plants; that the land was far off from the toddy-grove; that the plants required 5 or 6 years to be fit for tapping; & that the land was not fit for making a plantation of it. × No 88, 9 11-8-97

Whereupon the above enquiry, as brought to light by the reports of the Sheristadar, the Mojumdar & the Toddy Insp.rs, were reported by the Amildar to the Dy Comm.r. By this time the Shanbhogue had been dismissed by the Dy Comm.r's order No. 529/668 on the charge of misappropriation of Rs 3/15/- (vide para (2) of the records) × No 1017, 9 24-1-98.

The Amildar referred to this order

order in his report.

902, & 2-2-98

The Council, thereupon, ordered that the land might be given away for cultivation through auction-sale and directed the auditor to proceed with the work.

of dry area 6-3 a s with 1 date-tree & 5 plants with stems.

The sale was first notified to take place on 28-2-98. at the place where the land was situated, but the date had to be changed to 2-3-98 as the darkhast had to attend to a summons from the Munsiff's Court at N. Narasipur.

On 5-3-98 the Shekdar reported that the darkhast-dar had, in the sale, bid for Rs 1-0-0, i.e. 5 rupees less than the upset price, that the villagers did not compete as they thought that much inconvenience would be caused with regard to the

the correspondence that had
been going on ~~with regards~~ for
the separation of the waste
and its inclusion in the village-site;
and on ~~account~~ also of
the presence of road,
+ Kattu; that the landholders
had to pay that years
Kandayam besides the
purchase money; that
he was unable to pay the
market-price as he had to
pay double Kandayam
in the matter of Kuri-Sappa;
+ that he (Sheriff) required
orders as to whether or not
he should collect the
purchase-money.

In the meantime the
petr appeals to Govt against
the order of his dismissal, ~~above~~ already referred to
+ the records were sent in
accordance with the O.M. of 3-3-38;
further correspondence on the
point being suspended.

Part 2 - About Soppina mane.

On 31-3-96, Bomme-gowda, patel of Byalla-kere, reported to the effect that one Javaregowda of that village had un-authorizedly put up a wall on the slope of the tank-bund, thus block-ing up the way for men and cattle, and convert-ing the adjoining land into Soppinamane (Kitchen garden). that he would not obey the order of the patel directing him to stop erecting the wall any further and to de-molish the one already erected. that others also had been trying to follow suit with Javaregowda, that the land was a

Govt

Govt waste; and that
no Kaudapam had been
fixed on Jawaneporda.

The Shekdar who was
directed by the Amildar to inspect
the spot and report, stated
that the said Jawaneporda
alleged that he had put up the
Sopheia Madi according to
Manuel, only decreasing the
height by the wall; that it was
Jawaneporda's prayer that
Kaudapam should be fixed
on the land; that, as stated
by the patel, the passage
should be blocked up if the
tank bund were raised to
the level of the 18th grade Stone;
that other ryots had not
raised any crop on their
Madis on account of the
absence of any arrangement, and also on
account of the blocking
up of the way if they did so;

that

that if the wall erected by Javaneyonda was not ordered to be demolished other reyts would follow suit by similar erections, that the area over which Javaneyonda had raised vegetables ($\frac{Ab \times d}{a}$) was $7 \times 9 = 63$ sq. yds; that the said Javaneyonda replied impertinently when he said that he did not care a damn - hakdari so long as persons might as heretofore walk on the tank-bund.

On 17-4-96. the Amildar directed the following order to the Patel:-

"We are no sufficient ground to deprive Javaneyonda of the land which, as Sophia Naidi, had been long in his enjoyment. Show the land

[~~vide~~ Javaneyonda in one of his Muchalikas states that at the time of Inchcape measurement, the Sophia Naidi site, was left out of the Accounts].

come when I come to your village -

On 23-3-97 Gavanpanda wrote the following Muchalka :-

" My Sophia-nadi close to the back slope of the land leased out forming a portion of the village-site measures 63 sq. yds. I will pay the price of it at the rate of 1 Anna per sq. yd.. I do not build house on it. If at the time of the tank-repair, the pathway to tank or any other passage be blocked up I do not raise any objection to people going through the nadi or to the forfeiture of the price which I am now paying as well as the claim to this site. I do not plant in it any garden trees. I will preserve it as Sophia-nadi only. If I ever plant garden trees, the land

may

may be at once received by Govt."

After drawing up the ~~Strength~~ of the Mutchalika, the Shanbhoge (Chetty) certified that he had received Rs 3-15-a, the said price, from Jevanjeevanda and that he had entered the same in the Khirdi. The Shekdar, reported[x] the fact to the Amildar. The latter in his turn, in reporting all the above particulars about the Soppina Madi, & about the conditions of grants as laid down in the above quoted Mutchalika, recommended that, as Jevanjeevanda had consented to make allowance for the (future) raising in the Kirdi, the price received might be confirmed.

Whereupon the

[x] N° 683, § 19-a-g)

Mr Mowat after getting the
site in question defined in the
sketch by the coloured pencil
handed the following order:- × No. 363, 27-6-97

"The Soffinamadi site forms
part of the village site and
is attached to the Landholand.
The Sherdar's report states
that the raising of the bund
to the level of the grave stone
will stop the pathway below,
and that the grant of permission
to this man to make Soffina-
-madi will tempt others
to convert their madis, now
vacant, into Soffinamadis.
The land must however,
(one day) be raised to the level
of the grave stone. Under
such circumstances, does
it not seem to be improper
to recover now the price
of the land from this one
man binding him to the
condition of quiting it when
the bund should be raised?
Think over it again and
report.

No 103, 8 23-7-97

On 23-7-97 the Auditor reported* that the site to be granted was on a high level, but that the grant might be cancelled ~~as soon as the land was~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ as an precedent to ~~[illegible]~~

And then the D. Commr ordered* as follows:-

* No 167, 8 29-7-97

"As you suggest let Jawangonda be dispossessed of the site which he has unauthorizedly occupied for making the kitchen garden. He should have been punished on this occasion only. He should be warned in writing, not to trespass on the land in future. The amount recovered from him should be refunded

Now, when the question of refund came to be discussed it was brought to light that Mr Shanbhoga had actually failed to credit Rs 3-15- alleged to have been recovered from Jawanpowda.

Mr Amidon took the depositions of (1) Ram Gundaiya[x], The Shanbhoge, (2) Sreekantaya, the Shekdar, (3) Jawanpowda (4) Woodda, and then reported[x] as follows:-

"I have enclosed the records containing the depositions of Shekdar, Shanbhoge &c. taken by me when I found out that Rs 3-15-a recovered from Jawanpowda had not been credited to the Talur Treasury. From these depositions

[x] Translation of this is put up separately.

[x] No 323, Dy 28-8-97

depositions it will be seen that the Shekdar certifies the Amount as having been credited to the treasury believing (implicitely) in the writing of the Shanbhog. The Shanbhog, in his defence, states that he made the entry to the above effect (on the records sent with the Shekdar's pen) believing that the money would however be paid up by Jawanjmarda according to promise. The statement of the Shanbhog is ~~#~~ corroborated by the Shekdar's pen and by Jawanjmarda himself. The latter admits that he failed to pay the Amount, which is the case as shown

by the records. Thus there are not sufficient grounds to accuse the Shanbhogs of misappropriation. But there is no doubt that it was Shanbhog's mistake to have entered the Amounts as having been credited, before it was actually paid up, on the belief that it would be paid. He has received the Amount from Javanappa, but has failed to remit the same to the Treasury. He has therefore misappropriated it. No sooner was the enquiry set on foot than he seems to have run over Javanappa to his side. He is not a ~~Kayatha~~ Kayam Shanbhog, and may be warned this time and let off with a fine of Rs 5/-.

The Shekdar also

is to blame for his negligence. But, for the purposes of discharging his duties in a big hobli like this, he has to ~~rely~~ rely on the written statements of the Shanbhogs. The Shekdar in this instance has been warned to the effect that he would be subjected to strict orders if any laxity of supervision should be observed in him in future."

Whereupon the Dy Commr ordered :-

x No. 326, 27-9-97

"It is not the first time such objectionable conduct of this Shanbhoge was brought to my notice. It has also come to light that he had once before lost his post for some time on account of some

some mischief. You are directed to go through these records and report as to why he should not be removed from Sumerta ship.

On 16-9-97 the Amildar submitted the records* concerning the suspension of Ranjitsinga in the matter of Shanbhoba on a previous charge of embezzlement, in which instance he was ordered to be reinstated after furnishing a security. In so submitting, the Amildar touched upon the fraud* of Ranjitsinga in relation to the demarcation for S.No. 73 of Kalavinda Village, and reported that on the whole it did not appear from the nature of the Shanbhoba that he was capable of committing fraud & that he ~~committed~~ committed

it

*records part (4)

*(Vide Precis of part (3))

it wilfully; that, seeing that the firka has been long subjected to disturbances such as embezzlement & other crimes, it appeared that the said Ranjundaiya was incompetent; that the Shanbhogi was divided into two firkas of which Gollahalli scale had a pay of Rs 80-4-"* while that of Chikmagalur-halli Rs 67-8-".

And thereupon the Commr. passed the following order which is the one appealed against:-

"The records sent up have been perused. The said Ranjundaiya was for a long time suspended from service owing to the embezzlement of revenue collections and was again appointed

* No 5-29/668, 25-10-17

appointed as Gumasta on
condition of furnishing a
security for future good
conduct. ~~The said~~ Such security
does not seem to have been
furnished by the Offence
that came to light in the
meantime, the grant of
a false certificate and
the omission to remit to the
Treasury the Amount which
he ~~received~~ received on account of
the Forfeiture made it not
not ordinary ones. Moreover
it is evident from your (Amildar's)
report that he is incompetent
for work. The said Ram-
-jindaiya has therefore been
dismissed from the office
of Shanbhog Gumasta
and he must be relieved
at once.

"A competent member
should be elected from
the family of the Banavasi (Ramanja')
who is at present vested,
and

and if none should be forthcoming, some others should be selected,- one for each Pirka, and recommended. The persons so selected should be informed that they would not be deprived of the office for 5 years even though the Karavarddan should come and apply for it in the meantime."

Ranjundaya was accordingly removed, and one Shamanna, who had worked in the Shanbhoki-Office for 9 years before, when the said Ranjundaya had lost his Office, recommended to the vacancy. The recommendation was sanctioned* by the Commissioner

* No 741, dt 10-12-97.

The rest of the papers in the file relate to the proceedings

V

of the Amildar in calling upon the hakdars to appear before him. In the end one Ramasya Bhauthiya applied for the Bhauthiki stating that he was the hakdar and that he was then prevented from attending before the Amildar in person on account of his illness.

× on 11-4-98

P.K. 10/5/98.

As regards the ~~fact~~ certificate that Sno 73 contained no trees, the Kanbagne gramakara (applicant) has given his explanations, one that there were no trees on the cultivable portion & the other that from on 14/8/97 that it was an accidental mistake.

As regards the fact that he remit Rs 3-15- which had been collected from

Jawaresowda, the explanation
is that Jawaresowda
never paid it
If this explanation is
accepted, then Khurdis
might as well not be
written at all.

Even granting that the
appellant is conducting
certainly ~~falsely~~ that there
were no trees in Sy No 73
was not dictated by any
wrong motive, his conduct
in ~~not~~ remitting Rs 3-15-11
is, taken in conjunction
with his past conduct (the
records of which are not
complete), suspicious

My 21/5/98

The removal
of the Post
is of the first importance
to trade — The
Merchants
the receipt of money
from Correspondents
is three times
a week — wrongly
for that alone
this removal is
quite called for
Decline Tenders
regret that a Branch
Post Office
ought to have
been refused
the Stockholders
Conducts in regard
a Letter on hand
Such case before
may often lead
to ~~the~~ removal
friend and Country
Men in Mexico

96 98



35 Subj Petn No. 3018
10.8.03

Ori Petr Nanjundiah
Memorial re Petn No 129
& 20-10-02 praying for
review of Govt order No
2026 (Engl) & 14-6-1898
(Serial Nos in the file)
was received from it
the Maharaja with
letter declining to
reopen the case &
con. Engl. No 1292 &
22-11-02 was accepted
& Petr (Please see serial
Nos 32 to 34).

In the present petition
to which a 2 Rupee stamp
is affixed Petr requests
for a review or reconsid-
=eration of Govt Engl No
2026 & 14-6-98.

AH
14-8-03

The petition may
be filed as
No case has been
declared above
re-opened by
H. H the
Maharaja
Orders

18/8/03

37 (1)

1898

(1) 2nd stamp office Stamp duty L.R. 9-97

(2) Order complained of is dated 25-10-97

[Add 3 days 3-
25-1-98
1 to 28 days 28.
11-2-98]

No. 2026

Name of Petitioner Vanjundayya Shanbhogue Gumastha of

Village Gollarahosahalli

Taluk Channarayapatna

District Hassan

Date of Arzi 8-2-98

Date of Receipt 10-2-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure One

Addressed to the Dewan

ABSTRACT

Appeal against the Hasan Dt Dy Commrs order No. 59/66 dt 25-10-97 which is as follows

"The records sent up have been perused. The said Vanjundiah was for a long time dismissed from service owing to the embezzlement of revenue collections and was again appointed as Gumastha on condition of furnishing a security for future good conduct. The said security does not seem to have been furnished (ಆತನ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅಪರಾಧಗಳು ಬೆಳಕಿಗೆ ಬರುವ ಮುಂಚೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಟಿಫಿಕೇಟು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ). of the offences that came to light in the meantime the grant of a false certificate

(3) appeal against Dy Comm's order removing petr from Shanbhogue Gumastaship for his past offences & for failure to give security

(4) Not a Criminal Case

Petr would have got false belief that the certificate that accused had belonged to the A list was a clerical error. Though no petr admits it belongs to the B list the title of the error has to prevail

The title deeds of the land in which shows a sale of probably valuable

Rotn 24/2/98

Sd B Somasekhar
22/2/98

Call for relevant records

26/2/98

28/2/98

Sd
28/2/98

Sd
2/3/98

Sd
3/3/98

the fault of not having credited
the recovered sale amount of a certain land 38
named Soppinamadisthala
are not ordinary offences.
Moreover it is evident from your
Amildar's report that he is incompetent
for the work. The said Ranjundayya has therefore
been ~~relieved~~ dismissed from the
office of the Shanbhogue Gumastha
and he must be relieved immediately
A. A competent member should be selected from
the family of the Baravaddar
who has absconded, and if
no one is forthcoming some other
must be selected, one for each
Pirka, and recommended.
The persons so selected should
be informed that they would
not be deprived of the office
for 5 years, even though the
Baravaddar comes and
asks for it meanwhile."

The grounds of appeal are: —

(1) The sale amount of Soppinathota
was not recovered, as the purchaser
did not want the land and as
orders were meanwhile received
from the Dt to the effect that the
Sale should not be confirmed.
The Darkhastdar has also
reported in the Taluk to the same
effect.

(2) The entry of A in place of B in the
Darkhast certificate was only a
clerical error caused by pet's
serious illness and not by wilful
deceipt.

(3).

(3) That petr was seriously ill could be seen from the fact that the Shirastha Shekdar attended to the revenue collections of the Firka in the month of May, and credited the same to the Treasury. The Kirthi Books might be sent for and perused.

(4) That a security was demanded from petr, not through any fault of his but owing to the fact that the Amildar insisted on the same.

(5) That he had not committed any offences prior to this, as might be seen from the remarks of Mr P. V. Purnaiah, late Dy Commr

Prays that orders might be issued setting aside the Dy Comm's order and reinstating petr as Shanbhogue Gumastha.

Enclosure

Authenticated copy of order Appealed against

C.R.
12/2/28

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. ಪೆಂಪಿ 611
DATE 10-12-98

2026

1

42 Pet 1097 (2) 3-3-98

L.R. 99-97-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 2026 dated 8-2-98 received at the Dewan's Office from Ramajundaiya, Shanbhag guruvathe of Kalasa Kasabali in the Chikmagalur Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan dt removing pet from the guruvathe ship

is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Hassan District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

for ~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,
3/3/1898

2/3/98

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

ಕನ್ನಡ

21-4-98

Rep. putup 43 1178

21/4/98

L.R. 99-97-3

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

75-90

Pet 5-8

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

1897 (3)

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District

To

The ~~Chief Secretary to the~~
Government Dewan of Mysore.
General and Rev Departments
Bangalore

Dated 16th
Despatched } April 1898
Received

Enclosures No. Petn & its enclos: & 3 Pieces of Pr.

General No.
No. 1034

In reply to No 1097/1293 dated 3rd March 1898

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the petition from Layendaiya, Thangavelu Gurusta, Pattanaswamy Chennaiya, Patels of Ajjampura Patel praying for cancelling of Giroud Dharkast order removing petitioner from the Gurustaship.

Pet. 21
19.4.98.

References—(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Facts are not disputed
= Translate the explanation of the Petr in each case (Serial No 10 in A & Serial No 2 in file B)
21/4/98

Mr E Rama Rao
attended to
29/4/98.

Make an incorporation of No 213 in file A
29/4/98

Precis of Parts (2) + (3) put up in file A-
16/5/98.

Sub
11.5.98

Sub 5 L Commission
to the Peon
21/5/98

Rd Pon
22.5.98

Sub
22/4/98

No 1034

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Tavoy District.
Tavoy, January 16th 1895.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Tavoy District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Burma
General and Revenue Department
Rangoon.

Sir,

With reference to official memorandum No 1097 dated 2nd March 1895, with which was considered No 1015 dated 21st March 1895, calling for certain records connected with the case of removal of Hajee Mahomed Ismail Sahib, I have the honor to state as follows. —

1. Attached the registered Shanlaque of Hajee Mahomed, at his office of Shanlaque transferred to his favour for Kamaiya in 1892, remarking after a time the absconding Hajee Mahomed Ismail to do die with the Kamaiya same of age. Ismail Saib seems not to have absconded himself well in his will and was encouraged hereto for 6 or 7 years having been ordered to be executed imprisonment, the records thereof were reported to be missing.

vide Govt memorandum No 1097 dated 6th May 1890.

vide Commissioners notes above annexed to Shanlaque

2. Shamuna the sole nominee of Ismail Sahib is now certain disqualifications for in the matter of collection of Kamaiya and has absconding certain sums for which he had given security. The amount was instituted in which Shamuna admitted the balances of the totals and his liability to the sums entered in Kamaiya but

vide his deposition dated 6th June 1895

but not remitted. Subject to the disappearance of the record and may with the rate for criminal proceedings, benefit of doubt was given to Nagendra who was restored to the office of Sarpanch on condition of his giving proper security which he failed to do.

vide this file of Eggs dated 3rd August 1896

4. Subsequently in the year 1896 one Ramne Gonda of Kanakinda village in the Eggs division, applied for a due land bearing survey No. 8 Patel's Pantag-assessment Rs 5-3-0, for cultivation for the year thereafter. Under the application the said Nagendra alias certified that he had not been brought to trial by Legislature within 3 years before the date of application and had no fear of any kind standing thereon. When compared with the list in the taluk the Sarvajanik certificate appeared to be false, whereon a careful enquiry was held in which it was found that the person (sic) for cultivation had standing with Patel Kanta and the Kanara part are taken. Nagendra's explanation about his arrest in the matter was held unsatisfactory and untrustworthy.

vide Magistrate's letter and Judge Inspection's report to Collector 8th August 1896

5. Again in the report submitted at Sadashiva that the Sarvajanik of the said village had without Government permission, put up a wall in the site of the tank and thereby the water, for irrigation and using the adjoining land into a shrine and dedicated (illegible) it was ordered on enquiry and inspection of the case that a fine of Rs 3-15-0 at the rate of 4-0 per cent be realised from Sarvajanik and credited to Revenue. The Sheristadar returned the record to the taluk with a remark by Nagendra that the sum of Rs 3-15-0 was received and credited in the Khirdi. The amildar sent the record

vide Sheristadar's report & Sheristadar's receipt

vide Sheristadar's report No 683

6

to the Board Commissioners for Trades with his opinion that the land might be given over to the Land Board of the Legislature if over the land should be a legal act was, however, ordered that the land should be taken back and the reserved amount refunded. The Chairman of Treasury Board stated that the amount had been credited to the Treasury by the Municipal Council Magistrate who, however, was called upon to explain the omission as his last Magistrate — pleaded that he had stated the amount to have been received and entered in the Cash in the application and belief that proceeds would soon pay the money which the case covered. Though Income Board Inspector Magistrate's statement that the Minister was of opinion that proceeds had been won over by Magistrate.

1. The conduct of Magistrate was thus given to cause suspicion more than once and as he was simply a servant his removal was ordered.

2. The Municipal correspondence according to annexed list is herewith submitted for reference

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

[signature]

for Deputy Commissioner
Land Office

L. R. 99-97-K

47

Proceedings of the Court of Mysore

Read :-

Petn No 202 dated 8.2.98, of Ranjundaiya of Kollarahosahalli in the Channarayapatna Taluk, appealing against the order passed by Court Havaldar dismissing the petn from the Shanbhogi Kunaologiship of the above village

Letter No 1036 dated 7th April 1898, from the Asst Commr Hassan Dt reporting on the above

The record of the case

Order thereon in 11710/97-98

The removal of the petr is quite justifiable. The transaction regarding the receipt of money from Gangaramgowda is more than a serious irregularity. For that alone the removal

-moval is quite called 48
for. Court decline to
interfere and the
appeal is accordingly
rejected.

2. Government further
observe that the Commissioner
ought to have taken
notice of the Shetdar's con-
duct in signing a paper
on stamp. Such careless-
ness may often lead
to fraud as it possibly
has in this case.

Cr
9/6/98

for Secretary
13/6/98

11/6/98

To. The Hon. Rai Bahadur Harnandh
with records

+ Ref. of Record (3) Pages
15/6/98

50

11/6/98

Refer
14.4.99

57

(18)

1899

1393 dft 8 memo no 698 dt 18-2-99
Engd
Hrs Rejs petn
AK
15/4/99

L.R. 99-97-6

Subd
(1) Mustamped being addressed to H.H. The Maha Rani Regent.

(2) A previous application for review of Govt order No 1170 dt 15.6.98 was rejected on 29.11.98.

mlh
15.4.99

Perpte
Dy 20/4/99

Copy filed & made out
AK mlh
20/4/99

No order review of Govt is sought (1) A first appl^n for review has already been rejected (2 no 9)

Subd
Dy Commissioner
Dy 20/4/99

R^d 22/4/99

Decline to open
Mustard
Mud
22.4.99

Encl 1/2
24.4.99

Returned
24/4/99

No. 1653

Name of Petitioner Nanjundiah

Village Gollarahosahalli

Taluk Krishnarajapatna

District Hassan.

Date of Arzi 13-2-99

Date of Receipt 10-4-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 5

ABSTRACT

This petn is addressed to H.H. The Sowcarani Regent with reference to Govt Endt No 2026-9, 14-6-98 & states that the Dist Mg. Committee with the Amildar has done him injustice by dismissing him for trivial mistake, from the Kaledari Phombargi, but order has been confirmed in the appeal; that he is a poor man having two Mer means of livelihood

prays that quiet orders may be passed on the considerate perusal of all the records connected with his case, or that the Ag. Commr., Harran district may be ordered to hear him in person, with the records he may produce, & restore the Shambuks to him.

Enc: 1. order of the Ag: Commr, asking him to wait till the submission of the full report of this Case by the Assistant.
2. Order No 870 of 20-5-11 given by the Assistant.
3. Copy Instrument of release executed by Ramiah to the Petr.
4. Authenticated copy of the Ag. Commrs final order No 529/658 of 25-10-97
5. Govt Endt No 2036 of 14-6-98.

1659

No 44

MINISTRY OF NAVAL AFFAIRS
PETIT DE LA MARINE
RECEIVED
DATE

Petition

Mr. Mountain

Read with the Petition of Lieut. [illegible]

54

[illegible]

1899 [illegible]
13 [illegible]

55

L.R. 99-97-7

(20)

Petn a Shanbhogue belonging to H. H. the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretariat to the Govt of Mysore in the Revenue Department for orders.

L.R. 9/11

Petn may be informed that H. Highness the Maharaja declines to reopen the case.

By order
(Signed) D. Nanjundiah
D.C.S.
7/11/02 Private Secy to H.H.

Sri Krishnaswami
Spl. Asst at
5.15 p.m.
17/11/02

Please put up the file relating to this early
18/11/02

616 1902 C.7159-1898-99

Dy Commissioner of Hassan

Ex. 28.

17-11-02

18/11/02

Asst Secretary
19/11/02

1902-03

No. 1292

Name of Petitioner Nanjundaiya

Village Gollarahosahally

Taluk Hassan Channarayapatna

District Hassan

Date of Arzi 28-10-02

Date of Receipt 8-11-02

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

ABSTRACT

Memorial to H. Highness the Maharaja praying for revision of Govt order No 2025 (confd) dated 12-6-1898 rejecting his appeal against the Dy Comr's order removing Petr from the Shanbhogiga-matha Chief of Gollarahosahally village.

Petr submits that he was falsely reported by

by the Moulvi, of having failed to remit the amount (to the Treasury) collected by him from one Jabarè Gowda; that the Dy Comr and the Govt have passed the orders without hearing the pet[illegible]r, that the allegation is false; that he never collected any amount from Jabare Gowda and did not give any receipt.

Prays that he be reinstated after a Enquiry

13.11.02

Read from the
Private Secretary
the Maharaja's wish
No 699. dt 7-11-02
8-11-02.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
5 - 11 - 1902
TO H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read
5-11-02

129

ਸਾਹਿਬ ਸਿੰਘ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਤੋਂ ਹੀ ਇਹ ਪਰੰਪਰਾ ਚਲੀ ਆ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਸਿੱਖ ਰਾਜ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਵਿਚ ਜਿਹੜੇ ਵੀ ਸਿੱਖ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਜਾਂ ਰਾਜੇ ਹੋਏ ਹਨ ਉਹ ਸਾਰੇ ਹੀ ਸਿੱਖ ਰਾਜ ਦੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਵਿਚ ਆਪਣੇ ਰਾਜ ਦੀ ਸਥਾਪਨਾ ਤੋਂ ਬਾਅਦ ਇਸ ਦਰਬਾਰ ਵਿਚ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਭਰਦੇ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਰਾਜ ਦੀ ਸਥਾਪਨਾ ਦੀ ਖੁਸ਼ੀ ਵਿਚ ਇਸ ਦਰਬਾਰ ਵਿਚ ਨਜ਼ਰਾਨਾ ਭੇਟ ਕਰਦੇ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਦਰਬਾਰ ਵਿਚ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਭਰਨ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੇ ਲਈ ਮਾਣ ਸਮਝ

(3) 61



OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Bangalore, 7th November 1902.

No. C/7

L.R. 99-97-9

Resn
8-11-02

Petition —as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is

transferred, ~~for~~ —————— to the Secretary to the Government of Mysore, in the Revenue Department.

Petitioner may be informed that His Highness the Maharaja declines to reopen the case.

No
557
5.11.02

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

12

ನಂಬರ್ 1292 - 1 P

ತಾರೀಖು 20-11-1902

L.R. 99-97-16

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
14-6-78 ನೇ [illegible] 2026 ನೇ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 28-1-02
ನೇ [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

నిమంత్రణ పత్రికలు పంపడం - ప్రధానోపాధ్యాయులు

అందరికి —

తేదీ 19-11-02.

By order

Asst

Hon. Secretary